

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
NOVEMBER 11, 2011 IN THE STATE ROOM

- Present:** President Knapp, Provost Lerman, Parliamentarian Charnovitz and Registrar Amundson; Deans Barratt, Feuer, and Goldman; Professors Barnhill, Brand-Ballard, Casey, Castleberry, Cordes, Dickson, Fairfax, Galston, Garriss, Greenberg, Harrington, Helgert, Klaren, ~~Ku~~, Lipscomb, McAleavey, Newcomer, Rehman, Simon, Williams, and Wirtz
- Absent:** Interim Dean Akman, Deans Berman, Brown, Burke, Dolling, Guthrie, and Johnson; Professors Kessmann, Ku, Parsons, Price, Shesser, Wilmarth, and Yezer

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by President Knapp at 2:15 p.m

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on October 14, 2011 were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S STRATEGIC PLAN

Provost Lerman briefly reviewed the process that will be followed in developing a new Strategic Plan for the University. The Board of Trustees and the President requested that the Provost's Office take charge of formulating a plan to replace the ten-year old Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. The process is expected to take about twelve months from beginning to end. While the new plan will be in place for the next ten years, Provost Lerman said he expected to see the first significant outcomes within a three to five year period.

The purpose of the plan is to enable the University to make the best strategic use of its resources, present and future. The plan will be developed by following a ten-step process. An Executive Steering Committee to guide the process has been appointed and has now met twice. In addition to Provost Lerman, the following individuals are serving on the Steering Committee:

Cheryl Beil, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment
Doug Guthrie, Dean, GW School of Business
Forrest Maltzman, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Planning
Scheherazade Rehman, Professor of International Business and International Affairs
Terri Harris Reed, Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion
Brian Richmond, Chair of the Department of Anthropology and Associate Professor of Anthropology
Sara Rosenbaum, Chair of the Department of Health Policy and Professor of Health Policy and of Health Service Management

The first task of the Steering Committee will be envisioning the strategic climate GW will face over the next ten years. This will include considering what the future is likely to hold for universities in general, the U.S. and international education market, and GW in particular. The plan needs to take into account likely developments in societal trends, including the economic climate, demographic shifts, as well as the trend toward globalization. Also to be considered are GW's areas of existing strengths, and the role of technology in education delivery and the prospective demand for higher education among students of traditional age and adult learners.

Provost Lerman said he did not expect that the plan will be a blueprint for everything the University will do over the next ten years. The plan will lay out a small number of important themes around which the University community could coalesce. Not only could investments be made strategically from the center of the University in these major thematic areas, but schools and departments could also find ways to align their academic programs and hiring decisions with key elements of the plan.

As one example of a possible theme, Provost Lerman mentioned globalization and internationalization. The world in which we live is more international than the one in which our parents lived, and the world in which our students will live is far more likely to be internationalized than the one we live in now. If a theme such as this were selected as a focus of the plan, it could affect the curriculum, for example, the languages taught at the University. It could also affect the type of research undertaken, as well as professional training programs, for instance in law and medicine. A key element of the plan is building upon areas of strength by directing existing resources to them in order to bring them to the next level. GW's fundraising priorities will also certainly be aligned with key aspects of the plan.

Provost Lerman said he thought that to be useful, plans have to reflect real choices. Between three to six areas will likely be chosen as key planning areas. In order to gather feedback from members of the University community, the Provost's Office has started a series of dinner meetings with faculty members where ideas about the Strategic Plan will be discussed. One such gathering has taken place, and another is planned. The Steering Committee is also organizing luncheon meetings, where faculty, staff and students can come together to provide input for the plan. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees has been briefed on the process, and this will continue. As the Board has ultimate responsibility for the University, it is important for the plan to be something they will buy into and support.

In addition to these sources of input, two types of online forums will be utilized to gather feedback. The first is a traditional website that will provide information and periodic updates, as well as providing a feedback mechanism to the process; this is under design now. A second effort organized by Dean Guthrie of the Business School will utilize Facebook. The thought is that many GW students and young alumni will find this a more natural feedback mechanism than the traditional website. Both of these will be utilized to provide outreach to the University community, and gather broad input from as many participants as possible.

Discussion followed. Professor Barnhill said he continued to be very impressed with the discussion and the vision of what is happening in the world. He complimented the Provost again on this effort and the topics that are being addressed and discussed, and said he agreed very much with the way in which they were described.

Professor Barnhill said he thought it will be really important when planning these types of activities to have economic, financial and contingency analyses that will provide some idea not only of the investments that are being contemplated but the returns that may come back to the University. In addition the mechanisms that would be used to finance these activities need to be identified so that the potential risks and returns associated with various strategies will be clear. Careful thought needs to be given to diversification of the University's activities and how highly correlated the performance of these different areas of investment are to one another. If a set of strategic portfolio investment choices – strategic choices are adopted and all do poorly simultaneously, then the portfolio of investment activity the University is engaged in will prove to be insufficiently diversified.

Professor Barnhill added that he thought that a really important area in a global context that will drive income and employment levels is technology. This has been discussed at some length already, but Professor Barnhill said he personally believes there is some benefit in looking at the role of entrepreneurship in the context of globalization and public policy, particularly in how features of the global economy are integrated to push forward the economic wellbeing of the world.

Professor Wirtz said he thought that plan needs to consider undergraduate and graduate education separately, as these two modalities involve different competencies. And secondly, there is the question of what the primary role of post-secondary education should be, i.e., whether it is to prepare students for employment, or to develop thought leaders. The answer to this question would determine a very different set of emphases.

Provost Lerman agreed that thinking about the right portfolio for GW needs to take into consideration that our students are not a homogeneous group. Aside from the distinction between graduate and undergraduate education, there are important distinctions between graduate programs, whether they be professional or lifelong-learning oriented.

Professor Greenberg asked if at any point there will be an opportunity to identify who the primary consumers of the University's offerings will be, and if so, how these groups will be involved in thinking through what the University's future directions might be. Provost Lerman indicated that every effort would be made to do this.

Professor Simon said he thought one very real issue is the sustainability of the higher education process over the long run. It is important to recognize that students are affected by the market, but the market will impact the University. As an example, Professor Simon said he had come across information about specialties selected by members of his Medical School graduating class. About one-half to two-thirds of his fellow graduates selected internal medicine, pediatrics, or family medicine. Today, the numbers of students selecting these fields is about one seventh of his own class. As anyone knows who has tried to find an internist in downtown Washington willing to accept insurance, the market for internists is not as lucrative as the market for orthopedic surgeons or anesthesiologists. With high tuition at medical schools, most students graduate with considerable debt, and this has had a significant impact in the field of medicine.

In determining the direction the University will select in terms of its strategic plan, GW has to consider not only its strengths, but the external market. GW may be the best institution in the world in terms of philosophy, but the market for philosophers is not large enough to support many people. In order to sustain the University system, as well as GW, these factors have to be considered.

Professor Casey said she thought that engaging alumni in the formulation of the plan is critical. The Graduate School of Education and Human Development has an extremely dedicated group of alumni in many professions and industries. Engaging these alumni in a focused, direct manner is likely to be quite helpful in developing the plan.

Another key area of focus is leadership. This is a thread that is part of GW's history, and the development of thought leaders is definitely part of the future. Leading change across environments, whether in theory or practice is definitely something the University can incorporate in the plan and build upon. Provost Lerman said that he thought one thematic area that could be explored in formulating the plan would be the role the University might play in identifying skill sets and research necessary to build new structures to replace systems showing signs of failure – from education to governance.

Discussion followed. Senior Vice Provost Maltzman said that part of the Executive Steering Committee's conversation is trying to identify what is special about the University. One possibility is that GW could be identified as the nation's think tank, the place that solves problems and addresses issues with a unique focus on policy and its location in the nation's capital. Provost Lerman said he thought if this is identified as a theme, it needs to be determined how this will affect the educational programs, research programs, GW's outreach and internal practices. The impact of a theme on these four areas is one possible organizing structure for thinking about the plan.

Professor Rehman pointed out that many systems, such as health care, education, and economic systems are global common systems. There are other systems that run horizontally through global societies, such as ethics and social responsibility. These systems are simply not delivering at present, either for the market, or for the people.

Professor Castleberry said he had spent the past year serving on the International Programs Committee. One of the things the group learned in talking with people

throughout the University about international program goals and objectives was the need to help people thinking about new program ideas to gather the background and the data required to support new initiatives. Professor Castleberry inquired about the manner in which the conceptualization of the plan would be supported, and what resources would support this process.

Provost Lerman expressed confidence in the ability of the Executive Steering Committee and Institutional Research Office to provide necessary support for the plan formulation process. In each thematic area that is selected for implementation, it will be necessary to look at resources, generated internally and externally, that can be generated to support new programs. Increased research and philanthropy will be necessary.

Professor Castleberry said that he did not expect that there would be any additional significant amount of money in the Operating Budget to support schools undertaking new initiatives in the first few years after the plan is developed. He asked what kind of institutional support would be provided to implement the plan, so that new projects do not require the displacement of existing viable programs.

President Knapp commented that the University is accelerating its effort to bring in resources from outside the University. As the Senate is aware, GW is getting ready to launch a major Capital Campaign, which is now in the exploratory phase. The University has invested significantly in the infrastructure that will support that fundraising effort, including extensive outreach to alumni which is now much broader and deeper than was formerly the case. Another means of generating additional resources is the work of the Innovation Task Force which is tasked with the mission of identifying new revenue sources and internal savings that can be invested in academic programs. The target over five years since its inception is to generate \$60 million in recurring funds every year, which is equivalent to the total that GW obtains from its endowment each year.

Finally, there is the role of tuition in generating revenue for the University. The University's tuition has been a modest source, over the past four years increasing at or close to the rate of inflation. This increase applies only to the first year's tuition, which remains the same because of GW's fixed tuition structure. However, the tuition base continues to grow as the University is able to increase its enrollments at the Virginia Science and Technology campus as it cannot at its Foggy Bottom and Mount Vernon campuses because of the enrollment caps in place.

Professor Dickson said he thought it important to think about what the University should do in the years ahead, but it is also necessary to think about how it currently carries out its core mission of education. Technological change has challenged many sectors, including traditional broadcast and print media, some to the point where they have been forced out of business. The traditional model where faculty interact with groups of students by lecturing or leading a discussion may not be what the market or the students need. The question is how the University can best to position itself so that its education mission can continue as both students and technology are changing dramatically.

Provost Lerman responded by saying he considered this issue as part of the strategic visioning portion of developing the plan. It is worth pondering whether the economic and economic model GW and other selective private Universities now have is one that the world is going to want ten to thirty years from now. For the life of this Strategic Plan, GW needs to affirm that it is building a plan around a model that it believes will be successful over the next ten years.

President Knapp thanked Senate members for their input, saying he had heard a number of very thoughtful comments that would have an important influence as the Provost and the Executive Steering Committee go forward and design the planning process.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION TO FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Castleberry moved the nomination of Professor Jeffrey Brand-Ballard as Chair of the Admissions, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management Committee. The nomination was approved.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Castleberry presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is included with these minutes.

III. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman had no further remarks

IV. CHAIR'S REMARKS

President Knapp noted that it was Veteran's Day, and is the only time in the lifetime of those present that the calendar would read 11-11-11. A celebration was held in Kogan Plaza this morning and a number of veterans were present. Representatives from an organization called VietNOW presented to GW's current veteran students a very large banner listing the names of service members who have been lost in conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

President Knapp observed that there are presently 700 veterans or members of veteran's families supported by the Yellow Ribbon program. This is a program where eligibility is determined by service overseas, and one to which GW and Veteran's Affairs contribute 50-50 to cover the tuition of these students. GW has a long tradition of association with veterans, going all the way back to the nation's first President, George Washington. The very first veteran to be supported by the GI bill in 1944 was a man named Dan Balfour who chose to enroll at GW. Many of the University's prominent alumni are also veterans.

President Knapp announced that this evening would be the official opening of the GW men's basketball season, and he encouraged everyone to attend the home game against the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. This will mark the first game of the new coaching staff, so there is great interest in the contest. President Knapp said that, during the recruitment process for GW's new Athletic Director, he was struck by Patrick Nero's commitment both to the academic and athletic success of GW's student athletes. Mr. Nero was selected as GW's new Director, and has quite a proven track record in that regard both in his own coaching background and as a former commissioner of the American East Conference. Mr. Nero was also able to recruit the new basketball coach, Mike Lonergan, who is remarkable not only for having a winning record in every place he's coached, but also a one hundred percent graduation rate for his basketball players. President Knapp said he thought that the combination of interest both in athletics and the academic success of student athletics is exactly the right stance that an institution such as GW should take when it is engaged in intercollegiate athletics.

Lastly, President Knapp noted that universities are always complex places, and there are always surprises in any given week. This week, GW was presented with a particularly embarrassing surprise when it was discovered that one of the instructors in a Health Sciences program of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) had not taught two one-credit online courses that she was assigned to teach. Students enrolled in those classes were nevertheless given A grades. The instructor for those courses is no longer at GW.

The University is conducting an intensive review of this situation. SMHS Interim Dean Akman will be appointing a Committee composed of faculty from outside GW to examine and report on how this happened, and how it came to be that it took more than a year for this to come to the attention of the University. [The University learned of this as a result of letters sent to the Provost's Office.] The goal, of course, is to make sure this does not happen again.

President Knapp concluded by saying a line frequently used by Homeland Security, that is, "if you see something, say something." The University has a number of mechanisms through which people who have a concern are encouraged to bring this information to the attention of University officials. However unpleasant such news is to receive, the University cannot respond appropriately without it. GW is committed to ensure the integrity of its academic programs, just as it is to ensuring the safety and security of all the members of the campus community.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Galston asked if the Deans' Council has been apprised of the need to get all of the schools involved in the development of the Strategic Plan. She noted that Dean Berman of the Law School authors a blog, and this might be a way to generate interest in and comment on the plan among faculty members. Provost Lerman said that he has already held one retreat meeting with the Deans about strategic planning, and a second one is scheduled for next week. Both of these are half-day retreats. Provost Lerman said he thought it was a great idea for the Deans to generate mechanisms to communicate outward,

particularly because they are connected to their alumni and faculty in ways the Provost's Office is not.

Professor McAleavey asked how those with ideas about the plan should communicate before the website is online. Provost Lerman said that individuals should write to him and that he would bring the information to the attention of the Executive Steering Committee.

Professor Castleberry asked about the University's review of athletics programs in the spring, and if a preliminary report would be made available. President Knapp noted that some of the recommendations of the task force have already been put into effect, and a report will be made in February to the GW Board of Trustees.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

11 November 2011

Michael S. Castleberry, Chair

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Reports

As mentioned in the October comments, the Executive Committee continued the discussion on Faculty Senate representation at the November meeting. The Committee has sent to the Chair of PEAFF a charge to a) look at issues related to Senate membership; b) look at issues related to faculty representation as it relates to contract and other non-tenure line roles within the University; and c) issues related to the discrepancy between the by-laws of the College of Professional Studies and the *Faculty Code* on the process by which deans are selected. This inconsistency only came to light during the in-house search for the new CPS dean. Since all school and department governance has to be consistent with the *Faculty Code*, we are asking members of the Senate to review their school governance documents to ensure that all information related to searches for deans and chairs is consistent with *Code* requirements. The Executive Committee has also requested that PEAFF expand membership of the committee, or establish a subcommittee, or some other approach that affords full representation of the schools and the differing views that have already been presented and others which are certain to be presented. They will report to the Executive Committee and to the Senate at the conclusion of their work.

We are requesting that Executive Vice-President Katz make a presentation at the December meeting of the Faculty Senate on initiatives related to debt-restructuring and financial planning as it relates to the construction of the Science and Engineering Hall (SEH), the new SPHHS building, and the proposed Textile museum.

We have re-scheduled Development Vice-President Morsberger for the January meeting where he will present development information and the progress toward meeting the gift totals for the SEH and other projects.

We continue to discuss with the administration the establishment of the Committee on University Libraries, the status of the revised Patent Policy, and the revision of the *Faculty Handbook* which is now under the auspices of Vice Provost Martin. We will keep you informed as to progress on these matters.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Nonconcurrences

There are no grievances or nonconcurrences to report at this time.

Next Meeting of the Executive Committee

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for 18 November 2011.

Please submit resolutions, reports and any other matters for consideration prior to that meeting. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on 9 December 2011.

The Chair wishes the members of the Senate a relaxed and enjoyable Thanksgiving holiday.

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda

As mentioned in the October comments, the Executive Committee continued the discussion on Faculty Senate representation at the November meeting. The Committee has sent to the Chair of FSAF a change to (a) look at issues related to Senate membership (b) look at issues related to faculty representation as it relates to contact and other non-representative issues within the University and (c) issues related to the discrepancy between the policies of the College of Professional Studies and the Faculty Code on the process by which deans are selected. This inconsistency only came to light during the in-house search for the new CS Dean. Since all school and department governance has to be consistent with the Faculty Code, we are asking members of the Senate to review their school governance documents to ensure that all information related to searches for deans and chairs is consistent with Faculty governance. The Executive Committee has also requested that FSAF expand membership of the committee, or establish a subcommittee, or some other approach that allows full representation of the schools and the differing views that have already been presented and others which are certain to be presented. They will report to the Executive Committee and to the Senate at the conclusion of their work.

We are requesting that Executive Vice-President Katz make a presentation at the December meeting of the Faculty Senate on initiatives related to debt-restructuring and financial planning as it relates to the construction of the Science and Engineering Hall (SEH), the new SPHHS building, and the proposed Textile museum.

We have re-scheduled Development Vice-President Mosberger for the January meeting when he will present development information and the progress toward meeting the gift goals for the SEH and other projects.

We continue to discuss with the administration the establishment of the Committee on University Laborers, the status of the revised Patent Policy, and the revision of the Faculty Handbook which is now under the auspices of Vice Provost Martin. We will keep you informed as to progress on these matters.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Discontinuities

There are no grievances or noncontinuities to report at this time.

Membership of the Executive Committee

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for 15 November 2011.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

November 3, 2011

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, November 11, 2011, at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7th Floor.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on October 14, 2011 (minutes to be distributed)
3. Introduction of Resolutions
4. Update on the Development of the University's Strategic Plan: Provost Lerman (see letter and attachment from the Senate Executive Committee Chair)
5. General Business
 - (a) Nomination for election to Senate Standing Committees:
Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management: Professor Jeffrey Brand-Ballard as Chair
 - (b) Report of the Executive Committee: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
 - (c) Provost's Remarks
 - (d) Chair's Remarks
6. Brief Statements (and Questions)
7. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE OFFICE

MEMORANDUM

November 2, 2011

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

RE: University Strategic Initiative 2021

The University Board of Trustees has charged the Provost with developing a new Strategic Plan for GW that leads us through the next 10 years into 2021 (GW's 200th anniversary). To this end, the Provost has created a University Executive Steering Committee to assist him.

The idea is to identify and develop a few themes (pillars) that will leverage and maximize the existing comparative advantages of the University. The themes will be derived from a bottom-up effort from the GW community (rather than a top-down effort from the Provost's Office). Input from Faculty Senate members is essential to the development of these themes. This plan is explained in more detail (with a timeline) in the accompanying document of October 6, 2010 by Steve Lerman and Forrest Maltzman.

It is hoped that once the themes are determined, each of the 10 schools will look to see how they can contribute to the University's universal themes by a self examination and realignment, to the extent possible, of their own mission statements, goals, departments, programs, and fields. The Provost has stressed that this does not mean that "non-theme" related activities will be ignored or that they will not receive support, but rather that the themes/pillars of excellence will command significant resources and effort, including future fund raising.

This is to request that Faculty Senate members come to the November 11th meeting prepared to discuss potential themes (that are doable and operational) within the current framework of GW's strengths and weaknesses. To this end, please come prepared to listen to and discuss themes that you think are important over the 10 years during which the university can brand itself "world class". It will be necessary for Senate members to keep their comments succinct so that everyone can be afforded a chance to provide input.

I look forward to hearing more about the Strategic Planning Initiative from all of you.

Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Members of the Strategic Plan Executive Steering Committee

Steven Lerman, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Cheryl Beil, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment

Doug Guthrie, Dean, GW School of Business

Forrest Maltzman, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Planning

**Scheherazade Rehman, Professor of International Business and International
Affairs**

Terri Reid, Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion

**Brian Richmond, Chair of the Department of Anthropology and Associate
Professor of Anthropology**

**Sara Rosenbaum, Chair of the Department of Health Policy and
Professor of Health Policy and of Health Service Management**

Proposed Strategic Planning Process
October 6, 2011
Steven Lerman and Forrest Maltzman

This document lays out a possible process for the development of a new strategic plan for the George Washington University. The plan will cover a ten-year interval from now until the university's 200th anniversary in 2021.

The plan will not try to be all inclusive. Our university is extraordinarily diverse in all its aspects, and any plan needs to leave ample room for the wide range of intellectual pursuits and academic programs our faculty and students will undertake. Instead, the plan will seek to make explicit our assumptions about the future environment in which the university will operate, establish broad goals for us as we head toward the end of our second century, and select a small number of major thematic areas on which we will focus a considerable portion of our resources.

Ideally, the plan will reflect GW's specific strengths and weaknesses. We intend to avoid, as much as possible, generic statements that might apply equally well to hundreds of our peers. This implies that the plan will leverage factors such as our favorable location in the District of Columbia, the strength of our faculty and academic programs in key areas, and existing and potential ties to other institutions. In addition, the plan must be based on a realistic assessment of our university's weaknesses so that we focus our resources on initiatives that are important and where there is a reasonable probability of success.

We expect that individual schools will develop more detailed plans guided by the overall university plan. These school plans will likely be much more detailed. Some of the school-based priorities should link to the university's overall priorities, while some may reflect distinctive aspects of each school that are not entirely aligned with the university plan. Any university-wide plan must allow room for academic units to make informed choices with local resources.

We also need to acknowledge that a plan cannot remain static over a ten-year interval. The plan will aim to develop strategies that are best for us based on what we know today. We need to be prepared to alter these strategies should the future evolve differently from what we now envision.

The proposed process is organized in ten stages. In describing these stages, we have provided examples to illustrate the ideas that might emerge. However, these are only examples and should not limit the scope of the actual planning process.

While the stages below are described as a linear sequence, we expect the actual process to be more iterative. For example, as subgroups work on specific areas of the overall plan, they may need to revisit some of the assumptions about future economic and social forces that might influence the choices among alternative strategies.

Lastly, it is critical that the plan engage the widest possible range of stakeholders, including faculty, staff, students, alumni, and trustees, in as transparent a way as possible. We need to incorporate into the planning process mechanisms for feedback and comment through a combination of face-to-face meetings and electronic media. We

plan to brief the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees regularly throughout the strategic planning process.

Stage 1: Form Strategic Planning Executive Committee. A small Strategic Planning Executive Committee will be formed. This committee will help guide the strategic planning process. [Target: October 2011]

Stage 2: Envision the Strategic Climate. Develop scenarios that describe the likely future(s) for which we will be planning. Examples of areas to be considered are:

- a. Future research funding, including federal, foundation, and corporate funding;
- b. The likely profile of our students (graduate and undergraduate), particularly the number of traditional undergraduates (18 to 22-year-olds) and older students; the likely preparation these students will have for a college curriculum;
- c. Future prospects for philanthropy to higher education in general and GW more specifically, with attention to likely overall philanthropy, keeping in mind potential effects of possible changes in the tax code;
- d. Expectations of students and parents with respect to teaching, particularly the uses of technology and the mix of onsite and distance education;
- e. Likely competition from both our current peers and for-profit universities;
- f. Major challenges society will face in areas such as competition for resources (e.g. energy, raw materials, water, and agricultural products), climate change, skills needed for the current and future economy, and increasing economic, health, and other disparities, both domestically and abroad;
- g. Globalization, including the increasing competition from universities abroad, the challenges of preparing our students for careers in a more globalized society, and opportunities for GW abroad.

These future scenarios will be developed by a small working group and subsequently vetted through a series of meetings involving various groups, including the Strategic Planning Executive Committee, the university's senior leadership team, trustees, faculty, students, and alumni groups. [Target: start October 2011]

Stage 3: Develop Theme for the University's Plan. Articulate a single theme that might provide broad guidance as the plan is developed. Examples include:

- a. Enriching public life
- b. Engaging the world
- c. A commitment to service
- d. New synergies (used by Purdue)
- e. Building on excellence (used by Maryland and GW in our most recent plan)

The Strategic Planning Executive Committee will focus on this aspect of the plan. [Target: November 2011]

Stage 4: Select Key Areas for Planning: Develop a list of three to six broad areas the plan will address. Examples of these include:

- a. Research and knowledge creation,
- b. Learning,
- c. Reputation,
- d. Globalization,
- e. Fiscal integrity,

- f. Diversity,
- g. Student life,
- h. Growth of GW outside DC, particularly at the VSTC and other Virginia sites,
- i. Outreach on key topics such as sustainability and globalization.

While all these are important, narrowing down what will likely start as a long list will help limit the plan's scope to those areas that are most important. The list that emerges will be the framework for the working groups. A few areas, where there has already been significant planning, may be incorporated into the plan via an abbreviated process (e.g. our strategy in the area of sustainability, where an active process is already underway). The university's leadership should select key areas for planning in consultation with trustees, deans, and the Strategic Planning Executive Committee. [Target: November 2011]

Stage 5: Establish Committee on Strategic Planning. This likely will be a large group consisting of students, faculty, staff, alumni, administration, and trustees. The group needs to be carefully selected with an eye towards plan development and subsequent implementation, familiarity with the breadth of activities that occur at GW and around the world, and an ability to work together. In addition to being appointed to the committee, members will also be appointed to one of the working groups associated with the areas selected in Stage 4. There will be one working group designated to serve all working groups through the collection and dissemination of data. [Target: November 2011]

Stage 6: Develop Strategic Intent. The Strategic Planning Executive Committee will provide draft goals and charge questions for each working group. The working groups will then review the goals and charge questions and propose any amendments they believe are appropriate. Examples of goals might include:

- a. Research and creation: (i) To become known as an institution where cutting-edge research is conducted. Or (ii) To be known as an institution where research is translated into policy.
- b. Learning: (i) To educate our students to develop tools to understand scientific, social, and political problems. Or, (ii) fostering a spirit of creativity among our students. Or, (iii) to challenge our students to expand their horizons.
- c. Reputation: (i) To become known as an institution with top-twenty programs. Or, (ii) to excel on national rankings conducted by the Princeton Review or U.S. News. Or, (iii) to become known for nationally prominent scholars.
- d. Globalization: (i) To be globally recognized as an institution whose impact is felt throughout the world. Or, (ii) to become known as an institution where an appreciation of global challenges is promulgated. Or, (iii) to become an institution where all students acquire skills to function in a global economy.
- e. Diversity: (i) To ensure that all of our nation's talent is utilized.

Examples of charge questions might include:

- a. Research: (i) What steps can be taken to ensure that the university's top scholars collaborate outside with junior scholars? (ii) What can be done to ensure that merit-pay and tenure-and-promotion decisions reward excellence? (iii) Given the strategic environment, where should we invest? (iv) What steps can be taken to ensure that our hiring process produces world-class scholars? (v) What is necessary to build top-ranked doctoral programs?

- b. Learning: (i) How can GW's location be best utilized for enhancing the student research experience? (ii) What can be done to ensure that the university's top-ranked programs be utilized to ensure that other units achieve the same recognition of excellence? (iii) What can be done to foster undergraduate research?
- c. Reputation: (i) What rankings shape our reputation? (ii) Given the strategic environment, where can GW most efficiently build top-ranked programs? (iii) What non-academic rankings shape the perception of the university?

The Strategic Planning Executive Committee would supply the first draft of potential goals and charges to the working groups. The working groups and full committee would refine them, and they would be reviewed by the Provost. [Target: December 2011]

Stage 7: Select Assessment Metrics. Identify a limited number of metrics (two to five) to assess whether we meet objectives associated with the goals. Working groups would develop these metrics for the Provost's review. [Target: December 2011]

Stage 8: Develop Tactics. Identify the specific steps GW needs to take (as well as any that should be halted) to enhance the probability of meeting the goals identified in stage 6. These tactics should derive from the charge questions. Tactics need to be discussed and evaluated in light of the strategic environment and the potential challenges identified in stage 2, as well as in light of the university's strengths and weaknesses. The working groups will develop these tactics. For example, to meet goals set in the area of research and creation:

- a. Hiring for scholars who require substantial start-up costs should be done at a more advanced level;
- b. Portion of the funds the university provides for research could be set aside for collaboration between junior and senior faculty;
- c. Faculty overhead return could be doubled when there are co-GW PIs and when one faculty member is securing a first grant. [Target: April - May 2012]

Stage 9: Align Campaign Goals and Messaging with Strategic Plan. The exploratory phase of GW's fundraising campaign started in July 2011. At that time, we made it clear that the more detailed set of priorities should be derived from the strategic plan that would be developed during this academic year. Once the plan is near its final form, we will work with the leadership of the Development and Alumni Relations organization to develop case statements corresponding to our major strategic directions. Similarly, the strategic directions for the university need to be reflected in how we describe GW externally. This will involve working closely with the Office of the Vice President of External Relations. [Target: Summer 2012]

Stage 10: Present Plan to the GW Community. The plan will be drafted and prepared for presentation. The Provost intends to present the draft at the June 2012 Board Retreat and the Faculty Assembly in October 2012. Additional presentations to the entire community (perhaps through town meetings) will follow.